



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/647,946	12/06/2000	Robert C. Brunham	1038-1094MIS	7359	
24223	7590 05/23/2005		EXAMINER		
SIM & MCBURNEY			SWARTZ, RODNEY P		
330 UNIVERSITY AVENUE 6TH FLOOR			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
TORONTO, ON M5G 1R7			1645		
CANADA	CANADA			DATE MAILED: 05/23/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/647,946	BRUNHAM, ROBERT C.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Rodney P. Swartz, Ph.D.	1645	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
 Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>10Fe</u> This action is FINAL. 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E 	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro		
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 16-33 and 36-42 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 16-33,36-42 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction. The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	epted or b) objected to by the I drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	•		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on Noed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:		

Application/Control Number: 09/647,946 Page 2

Art Unit: 1645

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's Response to Office Action, received 10February2005, is acknowledged.
 Claims 1-15, 34, and 35 have been cancelled. Claims 16, 24, and 25 have been amended. New claims 36-42 have been added.

2. Claims 16-33 and 36-42 are pending and under consideration.

Rejections Moot/Withdrawn

- 3. The rejection of claims 1-15, 34, and 35 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,235,290, is moot in light of the cancelation of the claims.
- 4. The rejection of claims 1-15, and 34 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-17 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,344,202, is most in light of the cancelation of the claims.
- 5. The rejection of claims 1-15, 34, and 35 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baxby et al (*Vaccine*, 10(1):8-9, 1992) in view of Dascher et al (*Microbial Pathogenesis*, 15:455-467, 1993) or Douglas et al (*J. Bacteriol.*, 178(19):5573-5578) or Kaul et al (*Gene*, 87(1):97-104, 1990) and further in view of Anderson et al (*Inf. Immun.*, 64(8):3168-3173, 1996) and applicant's admission of record, is moot in light of the cancelation of the claims.
- 6. The rejection of claims 16-33 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baxby et al (*Vaccine*, 10(1):8-9, 1992) in view of Dascher et al (*Microbial Pathogenesis*, 15:455-467, 1993) or Douglas et al (*J. Bacteriol.*, 178(19):5573-5578) or Kaul et al (*Gene*, 87(1):97-104, 1990) and further in view of Anderson et al (*Inf. Immun.*, 64(8):3168-3173, 1996) and applicant's admission of record, is withdrawn in light of applicant's arguments.

Art Unit: 1645

Double Patenting

7. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

8. Claims 16-33 and 36-42 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 13, 16-23, 25-27, 33-37, 39, and 40 of copending Application No. 10/964,670. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because:

Claim 16 of the instant application is drawn to a method of immunizing a host comprising administration of a nonreplicating vector comprising a nucleotide sequence encoding a region consisting of ≥ 1 of the conserved domains 2, 3, and 5 of a major outer membrane protein (MOMP) of a strain of *Chlamydia* and a promoter sequence operatively coupled to said nucleotide sequence for expression of said ≥ 1 conserved domain in the host. Claims 17-33 and 36-42 add further criticalities to the method of claim 16.

Claim 13 of copending application no. 10/964,670 is drawn to a method of immunizing a host comprising administration of a nonreplicating vector comprising a nucleotide sequence encoding a MOMP fragment of a major outer membrane protein (MOMP) of a strain of *Chlamydia* and a promoter sequence operatively coupled to said nucleotide sequence for expression of said MOMP fragment in the host. Claims 16-23,25-27,33-37, 39, and 40 add

Application/Control Number: 09/647,946

Art Unit: 1645

further criticalities to the method of claim 13 which correspond to claims 17-33 and 36-42 of the instant specification.

Thus, claim 13 of copending application no. 10/964,670 utilizes vectors comprising nucleotides of any fragment of MOMP. This encompasses fragments such as those consisting of conserved domains 2, 3, or 5.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Conclusion

- 9. No claims are allowed.
- 10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rodney P. Swartz, Ph.D., Art Unit 1645, whose telephone number is (571) 272-0865. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 5:30 AM to 4:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynette F. Smith, can be reached on (571)272-0864.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 09/647,946

Art Unit: 1645

Page 5

RODNEY P SWARTZ, PH.D PRIMARY EXAMINER Art Unit 1645

May 18, 2005